

	Equity	Environment	Economy	Local Government	Other
Economy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustained economic prosperity 		
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools, good education Education Schools – quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality education Improve public education Uneven educational quality Infrastructure – schools & parks 	
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burdens from toxics of pollution Air quality Environmental health – pollution in low income communities of color due to new development, growth \$\$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality safeguards Urban vs. natural edge & preservation for lifestyle (baylands & inland) A proposed freeway that increases traffic, destroys affordable housing & damages the city & the environment A proposed elite golf course endangering 2 endangered species & using hetch hetchy water A proposed submission on baylands on habitat for 2 more endangered species on 12' of fill Protection of baylands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat Protection policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental – creek wetlands restoration Environment Keeping development out of environmentally inappropriate areas (i.e. the hills) Open space & ridgeline preservation Preservation of open space Effective brownfield redevelopment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental quality Environment
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment in deteriorating neighborhoods – infra., schools, etc. Equity for low income neighborss 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting the low-income 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keeping diversity of population (function of housing prices) Social equity - displacement Equity 	
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing affordability New residents (that have been pushed out by housing costs elsewhere in the Bay Area) pushing out established residents Gentrification / displacement Home ownership for lower income Affordable housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing affordability Being "built out"/affordable housing A proposed freeway that increases traffic, destroys affordable housing & damages the city & the environment Encourage development of more student & staff housing w/in walking distance of UCB campus Increasing affordable housing supply Increasing market rate housing supply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing Housing Housing affordability & availability Jobs/housing imbalance Cost of housing (as this factor affects) Housing – cost & availability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing Housing/jobs imbalance Affordable housing & availability Affordable housing for low & moderate income Lack of affordable or rental housing High housing costs/inadequate housing Opposition to housing Over-sized houses/mansionization High cost of real estate & housing Provision of range of housing opportunities Housing shortages Housing – unfriendly policies, esp. residential parking requirements Local opposition to higher density housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing & transportation for students, faculty & staff within economic, social, environmental & on-and-off campus communities No tie of housing acceptance to additional resources for open space & transit improvement Affordable housing Housing availability, affordability
Land Use / Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Auto-oriented land use development A proposed freeway that increases traffic, destroys affordable housing & damages the city & the environment Foster dense, mixed multi- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proliferation of ballot box planning; i.e. NIMBY-ism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development pressure NIMBY-ism Local gov't – state fiscalization of land use Insatiable demand for office space Successful reuse of Mare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perception that Berkeley is already dense; other cities should do their share No city analysis mapping underutilized land & quantifying development potential

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> story development at transit stops/stations ▪ Dealing w/ growth of neighboring Stanford University ▪ Need to revitalize downtown center ▪ Protecting farmland & Travis Air Force Base from sprawl development ▪ Implementing expected smart growth revisions to Fairfield general plan 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Island Preservation of community character ▪ Already very high density & rowter(??) populations ▪ Redevelopment & revitalization of waterfront & downtown ▪ Keeping development out of environmentally inappropriate areas (i.e. the hills) ▪ Encouraging & achieving higher density development ▪ Mixed use development; higher density acceptance ▪ Poor quality of new development makes people hate & fear growth ▪ Downtown revitalization/Neighborhood conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintenance of community character
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too much focus on extending costly BART (which also tends to enable white-collar workers to move further from the city) & not enough on buses & other less-costly modes (which tend to enable the forgotten majority ▪ Transportation ▪ Congestion ▪ Transportation - equal access for all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit service & infrastructure ▪ A proposed freeway that increases traffic, destroys affordable housing & damages the city & the environment ▪ Auto emphasis downtown ▪ Cooperate w/ AC Transit to facilitate passage of buses along city streets & transit modernizations along heavily traveled corridors ▪ Transportation congestion ▪ Improved job base to reduce regional commute traffic 80-680 congestion ▪ Avoiding transportation “improvement” which encourage greater auto use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic congestion ▪ Transportation ▪ Public transit - regional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only way to get through town is on 101 ▪ Lack of efficient public transit within city/county to support existing & future growth ▪ Cars & parking ▪ Improving existing urban transit network (MUNI/BART) ▪ Local traffic issues ▪ Increasing traffic congestion ▪ Inadequate public transit ▪ Gaining sub-regional consensus to approve appropriate regional transportation initiatives such as extending VTA from Santa Clara County to So. Alameda County ▪ Traffic congestion ▪ Lack of pedestrian – bicycle friendliness ▪ Transportation alternatives (rail, bike, bus) ▪ Transportation more choices ▪ Link to regional transportation system ▪ Overcrowded inadequate transit ▪ Regional traffic congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Affordable housing & transportation for students, faculty & staff within economic, social, environmental & on-and-off campus communities ▪ No tie of housing acceptance to additional resources for open space & transit improvement ▪ Traffic congestion ▪ Transportation – highways & cities, BART
Workforce / Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to new jobs, livable wages ▪ Access to jobs for low-income people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improved job base to reduce regional commute traffic 80-680 congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jobs/housing imbalance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing/jobs imbalance ▪ Community support for jobs 	
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure age & capacity to support population & lifestyle ▪ Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We represent No. Calif. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of stable revenue for city services ▪ Political will ▪ No regional coordination ▪ Improvement & maintenance of capital projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Airport congestion ▪ High cost of living ▪ Local/state finance ▪ Energy infrastructure

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Water supply/conservation▪ Neighborhood restoration▪ 	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	Equity	Environment	Economy	Local Government	Other
Economy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing companies to grow while not compromising the environment Keep Ag lands protected & Ag economy vital 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustaining economic vitality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .com Gold Rush mentality
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality education for existing & future populations 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for schools & infrastructure Quality schools available to all Educational quality at K-12 	
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality Environmental health – pollution in low income communities of color due to new development, growth, \$\$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing companies to grow while not compromising the environment Preservation of open space as infrastructure Greenbelt protection Keep Ag lands protected & Ag economy vital Protect & restore areas of open space, esp. those areas designated by open space council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion & air quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space/Agricultural preservation Need to identify & preserve premium open space Secure open space & improve urban parks Protecting open space / AG lands / habitat Preservation of open space Water supply / conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste of non-renewable resources Environmental quality Environmental protection
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gentrification/displacement Equity for low income neighbors Bringing community members to the table – encouraging public participation so that all Bay Area residents have equal representation & voice in planning process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality of access Gentrification & displacement Living wages (minimum \$8/hr) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining diverse communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including low-income folks in our economic prosperity Equity (jobs/housing balance) Widening income (wealth gap) 	
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing – affordability; land use pattern Homeownership for lower income Housing availability Affordable housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Live/work access (transportation – affordable housing) Increasing housing, both affordable & market rate Affordable housing Need incentives for individual cities to provide housing Build more housing where jobs are Affordable housing Shortage of housing near transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing No growth opposition to housing coupled with little (or no) support for infill development Balancing housing needs & habitat/open space needs Producing enough housing to match projected needs Increase in regional housing supply Housing – where the jobs are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting market demand for single-family homes Overall housing supply Meeting housing needs of households (below mod. Income level) Affordable & availability of housing Adequate housing supply: provide housing @ all income levels (esp. low & moderate) Opposition to housing Inadequate housing in relation to jobs Jobs/housing balance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of affordable housing near jobs Affordable housing
Land Use / Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional cooperation to affect & effect changes in land use revenue sharing Preservation & revitalization of neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compact mixed use transit oriented In fill development To expand rail transit using off the shelf technology & insist on dense, mixed development over & adjacent to stations NIMBYism Rebuild urban core(s) to reuse existing urbanized land @ higher densities Stop suburban sprawl Encourage attractive urbanized lifestyle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use planning De-fiscalization of land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link transportation & land use No effective limits on local land use decisions No effective regional planning @ any level Mixed use development; higher density acceptance Poor quality of new development makes people hate & fear growth New development is mostly low density, single-use sprawl, anti-housing, anti-density zoning in most cities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of state land use planning Compact development Limit development 101 corridor

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use planning – need in-fill & redevelopment near transit shopping malls 			
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation Congestion Transportation – equal access for all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive transit system Live/work access (transportation – affordable housing) Transportation pricing reform/global warming Compact mixed use transit oriented To cap & reduce VMT/capita To cope with impact of climbing wage levels on provision of bus transit service To expand rail transit using off the shelf technology & insist on dense, mixed development over & adjacent to stations Reducing auto use, primarily locally, but also regionally Transportation, more public Mass transit not increased auto transit Addition to auto-dependent suburban land use pattern/lifestyle Shift expectations towards everyday transit use Public transportation Provide greater ?? for mass transit use Failure to support transit investments with nearby housing Inadequate transit system (especially connectivity) in face of automobile system & saturation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion Reduction in regional commute mileage Congestion & air quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional traffic congestion Getting people out of cars & into public transit Link transportation & land use Provide mobility choices Inadequate regional public transportation system Extending BART around the bay – getting Santa Clara & San Mateo counties to buy-in Lack of transportation alternatives/mode choices Auto dependent transportation system, especially in newer communities Job growth away from transit Fragmented regional transit system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion
Workforce / Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job generation – for who ?? Access to jobs for low-income people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competition between local jurisdictions for firms/jobs Regional jobs management Local employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balancing jobs & housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community support for jobs Jobs/housing balance 	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CoC or C & C focus on growth (& the focus of most politicians) rather than quality Entrenched political power of wealthy corporations & some individuals – especially in that analyses are shared toward individual interest rather than good non-specious, econometric-type analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local fiscal reform Regional consensus vs. local gov't independence Consider a population policy – e.g. 2 pg. With incentives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional decision making Financing: infrastructure, housing, transportation Failure to thoroughly analyze suggestions & challenge unsubstantiated rhetoric Energy infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circulation options Jurisdiction cooperation Excessive population growth Excessive immigration Lack of regional gov't & cooperation Financial disincentives against smart growth (i.e., Prop 13) Local community's opposition to further growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of regional government Airport congestion High cost of living Local/state finance Energy

	Equity	Environment	Economy	Local Government	Other
Economy	▪	▪ New progressive businesses	▪	▪	▪
Education	▪	▪	▪	▪ Improve public schools	▪
Environment	▪	▪ Local regulations in development impacts to open space ▪ Clean up of toxic sites & more green space	▪	▪ Agricultural land preservation	▪ Land use patterns that reduce automobile travel (+ air, pollution, noise...)
Equity	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
Housing	▪ More affordable housing throughout the region ▪ Decrease housing development along I-80 corridor	• Create disincentives/incentives for jobs/housing balance regionally & by county • At least ½ new jobs in next 10 years (500,000) should be in areas where housing exist (e.g., Tracy, Stockton) • Building large amounts of housing (dense, high-rise) at transit nodes throughout region	▪ Provide higher density housing near transportation nodes ▪ Need more land zoned for housing ▪ Change fiscal policy (taxation, revenue sharing, incentives) so that provision of housing by city/county gov'ts does not have negative local \$\$ impact ▪ Higher housing densities	▪ Additional affordable housing that meets market demand in the central Bay Area ▪ More housing ▪ Regional large hot single family home transfer fees (significant) ▪ More housing & jobs closer to housing ▪ All communities provide more housing/higher housing densities – esp. in Silicon Valley ▪ Taking fair share of affordable housing ▪ Requiring the cities that produce job growth, provide an equivalent amount of housing growth ▪ Limit local communities ability to create jobs w/o housing ▪ More affordable housing near employment centers in Marin & SF ▪ More housing in proximity to Silicon Valley	▪ More zoning for housing ▪ Jobs/housing balance
Land Use / Development	▪ Regional investment in housing & revitalization that recognizes existing communities as the building block – must benefit existing residents as well as accommodate new growth ▪ More mixed use communities	▪ NIMBYism ▪ Create incentives for transit-oriented development	▪ Re-use surplus state/federal/local properties into housing/mixed use development ▪ Higher density in development	▪ De-fiscalize land use ▪ Higher density in “elite” communities ▪ Pedestrian communities ▪ De-fiscalization of land use cannot be achieved w/o collaboration among cities & counties, school districts & special districts ▪ Dense, mixed use development, emphasizing housing surrounding all of the transit stations & corridors leading into the city	▪ Land use patterns that reduce automobile travel (+ air, pollution, noise...) ▪ Reduction of sprawl ▪ Regional planning
Transportation	▪ More transit ▪ Improve public transit, BART & AC Transit ▪ Bringing public transit to areas in need of it ▪ Need to consider how & which communities are affected by development of highways &	▪ Better transit on the peninsula would decrease the need for neighbors to drive in SF, Oakland, etc. ▪ Extension of BART south ▪ Increase the charges (reduce subsidies) to motorizing through tolls & fees/taxes on parking	▪ BART extensions ▪ Expand/extend transportation infrastructure ▪ Better regional transit links – a true regional authority	▪ Rail line, ferry option from the No. Bay ▪ Continuous HOV lanes from SF to Santa Rosa & other areas in the Bay Area ▪ Greater point to point mass transit ▪ Regional gas tax	▪ Land use patterns that reduce automobile travel (+ air, pollution, noise...)

	affected motor vehicle transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To encourage major employers to concentrate jobs within walking distance of transit ▪ Access to public transport ▪ Fund cost effective transit – no more BART extensions 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific plan for Visitation Valley – third street light rail (San Mateo/SF link to housing) ▪ Very large regional investment to create a world class fixed rail system (ala NY) ▪ BART extensions ▪ Public transit (rail) to Marin & SF ▪ Complete BART around bay, link to local transit ▪ Additional access to regional transportation system ▪ More funding for transit improvements in the urban core ▪ Complete the Caltrain downtown extension/regional rail hub 	
Workforce / Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What about jobs? Regulatory structures? But given this constraint, I don't know. I would want \$10-20/hr blue-collar jobs within five miles the most. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More housing & jobs closer to housing ▪ Requiring the cities that produce job growth, provide an equivalent amount of housing growth ▪ Limit local communities ability to create jobs w/o housing 	Jobs/housing balance
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SF airport expansion is a + ▪ Yes on D, No on C ▪ To seek tax & revenue distribution legislation that encourages smart growth ▪ Regional government to override what actions local governments do to harm regional interests ▪ Need greater regional planning with locals support it ?????? then ?? – changes made s????? re: fiscalization land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fair compensation to landowners whose land is taken for open space view sheds/habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oakland 10,000 (10K initiative) to be successful ▪ Institute regional sales tax sharing 	

	Equity	Environment	Economy	Local Government	Other
Economy	▪	▪ New progressive businesses	▪	▪	▪
Education	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
Environment	▪	▪ Clean up of toxic sites & more greenspace & more recreational sites	▪ Brownfields development	▪ Funds to preserve ag & open space ▪ Money to clean up brownfield sites ▪ Protect useable agricultural land (primarily in the central valley) not just all ag land	▪ More permanent access to natural space with creekwalks, BayTrail
Equity	▪ Again, assess needs of communities that are underserved & make public transportation more accessible	▪	▪	▪	▪
Housing	▪ More affordable housing ▪ Decrease housing development along I-80 corridor ▪ More housing near BART	• Stop job growth, build housing • Building significant amount of mixed-use high density housing at Downtown Berkeley, Ashby & North Berkely BART stops	▪ Higher density housing ▪ Economic incentives for housing development ▪ More density, less parking w/ new residential development	▪ Infill housing in San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland ▪ Incentives to make housing pay for itself ▪ Minimum higher density housing in city coves/pedestriancove/mixed use development ▪ Req. for inclusionary housing for commercial development (a certain amount of sq. ft. of housing for every sq. ft. of commercial developed) ▪ Higher acceptance of higher density housing ▪ Give local govts incentives to build housing & especially to let it pay for itself in the long run ▪ Affordable housing built near employment ▪ Increase in provision of housing & recreational opportunities for the region ▪ More dense housing in SF transit hubs & corridors, especially along the BART & Caltrain lines	▪ More housing within walking distance of transit ▪ More rental housing
Land Use / Development	▪ Transit-based development	▪ Preservation of East Palo Alto as affordable ▪ To seek tax & revenue distribution legislation that encourages smart growth ▪ Commitment to infill redevelopment ▪ Greater quality density, we like better denser options for communities to encourage vitality of many transit expenditures	▪ Expedite development of port & military bases ▪ Regional context for land use & transportation decisions based on regional consensus for future goal	▪ Concentrating development in built areas so density patterns can sustain transit ▪ More transit oriented development ▪ More mixed use development ▪ Marginal increases in density generally rather than large increases in few places	▪ Regional planning
Transportation	▪ Improve public transit BART & AC Transit ▪ More transit investment ▪ Make public transportation	▪ Transportation pricing reform: cash out, hot lanes, BART market parking charges, carbon tax swap, N'd parking	▪ Fast track strategic improvements to road & highways —better transit coordination	▪ I-680/I-80 interchanges are a major regional bottleneck ▪ HOV lanes from SF to Santa Rosa	▪ Ferries to the East Bay ▪ Completion of continuous HOV lanes ▪ BART to San Jose

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more accessible Highway development & MV transportation is problem to communities in close proximity to roadways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> management & traffic calming, congestion pricing To cap & reduce VMT/capita To cope w/ impact of climbing wage levels on provision of bus transit service To expand rail transit using off the shelf technology & insist on dense, mixed development over & adjacent to stations Increase the charges (reduce subsidies) to motorizing through tolls & fees/taxes on parking Access to public transportation, more ferries Reduce VMTs for all – not just SOVs Replace parking lots around BART stations (WC + Lafayette) w/ mixed use (?? Housing) have paid parking in multi-story garages (underground) and use proceeds to subsidize free shuttles to BART 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more transportation improvements/infrastructure Regional context for land use & transportation decisions based on regional consensus for future goal Better regional transit links 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More buses Massive shuttle systems Improve & expand urban transit (MUNI/BART/AC) Give Caltrain the headways & reliability of BART; or just bring in BART Much more \$\$\$ for transit Funding by users of transportation improvements Link non-auto transportation w/ each other: e.g. run rail (Amtrak) into the 3 regional airports, connect rail w/ BART. Connect SFO & Oakland airport w/ new Transbay Tube for BART, then no need for SFO expansion Rail & bikeways More diversified transit opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better transit coordination
Workforce / Jobs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes from workplaces being created/built in a non-affordable community Stop city approval of more jobs in the severe job surplus localities To persuade major employers to concentrate jobs w/in walking distance of transits More good paying jobs Stop job growth, build housing 			
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to strengthen local revitalization of jobs & housing that can also accommodate regional growth, improved education & training to meet job demand Hard put to use in living-wage jobs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong armed regional government to over-ride local decisions when they go against the region 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rebuild the SF planning dept. 	

	Equity	Environment	Economy	Local Government	Other
Economy	▪	▪ Local business incentives for traditionally poor neighborhoods	▪ Remove barriers to private initiative & enterprise	▪	▪
Education	▪	▪	▪ Schools	▪	▪
Environment	▪ Using strategies that protect air quality	▪ Preservation of farm lands/agriculture as profitable & desirable lifestyle	▪ Regional energy strategy	▪ Visitation Valley: work on specific plan for San Mateo/San Francisco on brownfields site (Tuntex) coordinated w/ \$1.1 billion Third Street light rail project. Tuntex has 500 areas on brownfields should be next "Mission Bay"	▪
Equity	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
Housing	▪	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home ownership incentives • ABAG policies revised to stop directing housing growth to outlying counties • Helping Californians understand dense apartment-based housing as Europeans and to a bigger extent, New Yorkers do 	▪ Change state housing element policies to provide for disincentives for local elements that are out of compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stronger support for high density housing ▪ Make housing as profitable to cities as a Costco ▪ Withhold grants, etc, from communities that don't build housing ▪ Reduce ability to raise CEQA challenges to hsg. Projs. ▪ Require hsg. To be built @ some minimum density ▪ Develop more affordable housing in the Bay Area – not in San Joaquin County ▪ Making the job centers (ie, Silicon Valley) be responsible for providing affordable worker housing ▪ Create incentives for cities to zone for Dense housing 	▪
Land Use / Development	▪ Stronger linkage between regional development & low-income community development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Market-based incentives. Studies show that dense neighborhoods require less driving & thus auto ownership. Allow for fewer parking spaces w/ how residential & commercial space, while encouraging compact development overall ▪ Drivers, cities & businesses are not responsible for the external results of their choices. An ideology of money-based measurement & of carism leads to unsustainable & auto dependent development ▪ Permit & encourage development over & adjacent to transit stations ▪ Legislative actions to reward 	▪	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Urban growth boundaries ▪ Development right credits??? ▪ Economic incentives for local gov. to provide housing/transit oriented dev. ▪ Stop using tax dollars to pay for freeways to outer areas which creates urban sprawl. Use those dollars to pay or inner city higher density infrastructure improvements ▪ Md. Approach – Concentrate infrastructure \$ in urban areas ▪ Fiscalization of land use ▪ \$\$ for TOD, mixed use & infrastructure, Also for open space. Regional commercial impact fees for Aff. Housing. Inclusionary zoning 	▪ Infrastructure \$ tied to compact land use (regional plan.) Fiscal reform (remove big box on freeway incentive.) Open space access tied to compact land use

		<p>building if transi-oriented, multi-family dwellings, cities that don't meet their housing goals in their general plan would be penalized (no return of gas taxes?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State or regional planning & design funds 			
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterate: need cost of driving to be paid more directly by the consumer – gas price, road tolls, etc. Show that public transportation access will be brought to communities who need it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce direct & indirect subsidies to motoring Expand regional rail transit network b/c of rail productivity advantage (1driver, 1000 passengers) relative to buses as wage level climbs Stop funding transportation projects that support sprawl Higher tolls & parking fees – maybe fee to drive to downtown San Francisco. Free public transportation in all urban areas (no fare) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional transit authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicle “impact fee” assessed in multiple personal vehicles Get rid of Caltrains regs & bureaucracy for spending money Congestion pricing for the f'way system \$ for pedestrian imps. – w/o Caltrains restrictions Provide more parking at BART, busy people won't mess with shuttle buses, but charge for it Tax incentives, congestion pricing Allocate more transportation \$ to cities that 1.) have jobs-housing balance, 2.) build dense around transit. Cities that sprawl or have to steep a jobs-housing imbalance should get nothing Consolidate regional transit providers 	
Workforce / Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't develop jobs without comp. Housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Penalize excessive job production Most new jobs located out of Bay Area quality of life, not solely from economic growth 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balancing jobs & housing based on income & price levels in addition to just raw numbers 	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminate Prop. 13 protection for business property aimed for business Encourage revenue sharing bet. City/County Bring more of the public to the table Increase outreach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local incentives that support regional goals As Gore has proposed a “Livability Agenda” for Smart Growth, including \$900M in financing incentives, plus \$39.5M for planning tools, all to be controlled by local govt's. I hope the Alliance engages this program Legislative to give a tad break for living near your job Population policy Bottoms up alone is insufficient. There must be regional incentives & penalties Fiscal reform state lend revenue sharing among ??? charges to local zoning Tools to look at big picture impacts & respect local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamline permitting at all government levels Regional sharing of revenues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support at state-level (no permit for 2nd units, elimination of constraints on condo dev, CEQA exemption for hsg. Dev. Consistant w/ the GP in urban areas), state incentives/changes to neutralize sales tax bonds Income tax incentives to live near workplace Funding to schools, cities & counties that practice smart growth Revenue sharing Financed incentives for smart growth Change the way sales taxes are distributed, ie – per capita distribution state-wide, not on the basis of point of sale Elected regional government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rigorous focus of regional infrastructure & federal/state/regional investment funds to carry out livability plan Additional real authority by regional agencies over local land use issues Altering local/state finance tax credits for preferred developments

		impacts as well – I think that mapping project can help do that – who is involved will be key			
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

	Equity	Environment	Economy	Local Government	Other
What local smart growth or sustainable development initiatives should we know about and/or coordinate with?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban Habitat Program will be developing a guide for public participation in this process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our agency is just beginning to work w/ & leverage local programs & make open space an issue locally The Hayward BART – CSUH supper shuttle Development of n'ds of – 10,00 on 100 acres on BART parking lot – 3 to 4 strong, un ???, mixed use Eco-pass, free transit at new housing developments FF Gen Plan revisions towards smart growth scheduled for Oct-Nov 2000. Orderly growth initiative in effect until 2010 in Sol Cty directing growth to cities & preserving land zoned for ag. Sonoma-Marín transportation land use study Do not wait 2+ years for results of work plan. Urge pragmatic gains continuing from now (restore neighborhoods, expand public transit, etc.) Andrew Thomas, in Berkeley City Planning's office who is trying to increase FARs & density in downtown Berkeley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inter-regional Partnership Keep track of current federal smart growth initiatives/leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Fairfield is revising its General Plan – call Dave Feinstein @ 707-428-7448 San Rafael & Marin countywide plans undergoing updates this year & next (need to coordinate dates of public workshops) League of Cities principles Fran Martin Visitation Valley Alliance/Urban Ecology David Alumbaugh, SF Planning Dept. Jill Keimach, El Cerrito City of San Mateo: transportation corridor plan; El Camino Real plan – not clear criteria or planning model – we need to get beyond just putting local ideas together Pleasant Hill BART station development a good model of intensity near transit Sustainable Sonoma County CCC City/County relations committee (Mayor's Conference) Consolidate MTC & ABAG Create incentives in RTP for \$ for urban core, TOD, mixed use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surprised JVSF not represented here today. Project should work at their 2010 projections, publications, & others In coastsides San Mateo, revisions to Half Moon Bay general plan/local coastal plan & SM county LCP for midcoast urban areas Silicon Valley Housing Transit Fund Manufacturing groups land use mapping project
What advice do you have to improve the process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be clear about the objectives; expectations & the decision making mechanisms for action maps are a great tool for looking at patterns of growth – many issues will arise – where will such things be fulfilled? Who is acting? Who is receptive? What will it take? Consider more than 1 workshop per county in doing public outreach so can do day & evening mtgs. Never seen a design charrette for a nine-county area...hope it will work Need to be more explicit about social equity outcomes being ??? by the process. Develop equity indicators Pressure on elected officials to participate from all cities & counties in the Bay Area Greater outreach to engage more than the usual suspects Need accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ask "sponsors" of meetings to reach beyond regular list they have & get to community churches/renters/schools etc. for "bottom up" approach More knowledgeable & progressive news editors Campaign finance reform to counter-balance developer paid hit pieces that defeat environ. Candidates At the end of the process, a list of necessary changes to state legislation (including constitution) should emerge Omitted are: hard steps to take to regional governance. State legislation to help local governments implement smart growth strategy More meetings, more sharing of data/studies already done Procedural meant to insure "bottom up" approach Get word about incentives out early to local govt so that they recognize value of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invite the suppliers of housing developers, lending institutions to discussion Agree upon, use & publish/promote best practices for economic analysis & sound science Stick to pragmatic means of achieving regional goals. Legislative changes will be required (changes via action in the state legislation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings to few – input will be limited Inserts in local papers as PR/info & feedback Have workshops to "unveil" scenarios to initial participants: can rec what happened to their ideas Include PTA & school boards as stakeholders; and SELAC leaders Include religious community & faith-based organizations Stakeholders include board presidents of all umbrella groups (cultural, child care, sports, interfaith, labor, medical, social service, youth leaders) Smaller counties don't need more than one workshop each cycle Check in after workshops that they were representative Consider back up focus groups Consider Blue Ribbon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pay attention to creative media use: TV, web, CDs & videos; & remotely sensed (RS) geographic information (GIS) & global positioning system (GPS) imagery & data outputs Teleconference between county organizers after each county meeting so that counties learn from each other Increase participation from the development sector – they were clearly under represented at this meeting Highway/housing/commercial/industrial/retail Keep public informed

		<p>involvement in this process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shorten projected time schedule ▪ Strongly encourage ABAT to harmonize city efforts & build a regional GIS ▪ In planning, take energy conservation (esp fossil energy) as an explicit goal 		<p>Workshops where by invitation leaders are invited; public welcome as well</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Education of public on smart growth ▪ More grass roots: PIA (Peninsula Interfaith for Action) , League of Alma Vates; labor; faith based organizations; chambers of commerce ▪ Work w/ BATLUG on presentations for small neighborhood associations ▪ Require state legislature & fed reps to attend ▪ Involve Silicon Valley org: Manu Group, JVSU, where were they Friday? ▪ Begin now on implementation/incentive development. We know the problem & we know at least some of the answers. Let's get on with it ▪ Where were the political representatives of the cities of SF, San Jose, & Oakland? They need to be participating in developing these solutions ▪ I don't know if it's possible to have a successful consensus process re: these issues. No real process w/ professional input/just putting together ideas of whoever shows up @ mtgs. ▪ Need to engage folks outside 9 Bay Area counties ▪ 1yr to analyze info is too long ▪ May need more time for input ▪ We all know & for the most part & agree on the issues; but what are we going to do about it? Focus? <p>Defiscalization of land use will not occur unless cities/counties can present a united approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public education/media involvement ▪ Recognize each area is unique with unique concerns – blanket regional approaches that do not respect this uniqueness will not be accepted at the local level ▪ More public involvement ▪ Don't preach to the choir ▪ Use the process to educate 	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> participants what the difference between “smart growth” vs. “dumb growth” Bottoms up will not work everywhere where “smart growth” has happened, someone at the top had the vision & was an advocate 	
What information or maps would be useful for workshop participants?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to bring down to a local scale (maps) show alternative footprint maps to discuss implications Interactive presentations – so can show the layers Develop an interactive dynamic system such as that on OUSDs map center website Equity indicators should be developed for all the priority issue areas: i.e. hsg., econ. Dev., jobs, environment, etc. City & county maps showing: urban limit lines, areas zoned for housing, areas zoned for commercial Needs of transportation – where public transportation is accessible & not – relating traffic flow to communities location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superdistrict maps with trunks Adjusted job surpluses for 2000 & 2010 Housing potential in severe surplus localities for dense car-free etc. development Stills or videos or TODs that work especially from overseas (since there are few in the U.S.) Density & population maps containing historical info., e.g. 50 yrs ago, SF had 50,000 more people than it does today Commute trends Educational resources scored by city/town What are the sources of the data for each map? Bay Area wide maps like presented during this session to provide a regional perspective as a starting point. Countywide maps to show county perspective, esp interaction w/ cities Your “Bay Area Job Housing picture” is extremely informative Show commute times (by auto) from out of Bay Area A comprehensive regional GIS, published on CD-ROM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available developable properties/sites “Raising the roof” report maps – ask John Landis UC Berkeley, urban planning Sacrifice land vs. land consumption – (Landis info) Energy use/cost/outages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Model ordinances for cities I like what they did in Utah. A piece representing development @ a certain density; put on a map, stack them, etc. to show impact on O.S. use of various types/densities of development. Show where in fact hsg: ?? base case will be built – how much in outlying areas For Solano county, information about commuting to and from Sacramento A map showing urban growth & developed land in 1960, 70,80, 90,2000 & as projected to 2020 (power point & map form) A map showing significant environmental resources, threatened habitats & other areas that are threatened Take the county lines off some maps to facilitate thinking about land use issues as Bay Area issues Best Practices/case studies – 1.) examples of well done plans & TODs, 2.) what we want to avoid – i.e. BART/SFO extension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BASIC has valuable IKOMOS imagery of the Bay Area obtained for this project, at no cost (subject to certain conditions imposed by the originator) Anticipated transit system & major hubs Density of existing residential development; mixed use Soil fertility (primary land, wetlands, creek) Existing urban limit lines, regional, state parks, airports Composite of zoning map Undeveloped parcels map Growth trends, projections